



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

HA

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/727,573 12/01/00 DENHOLM

E IT 105

EXAMINER

HM23/0513

PATREA L. PABST  
ARNALL GOLDEN & GREGORY, LLP  
2800 ONE ATLANTIC CENTER  
1201 WEST PEACHTREE STREET  
ATLANTA GA 30309-3450

MELLER, M.

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1651

2

DATE MAILED:

08/13/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Docketed for ① 9-13-01 Rmdr  
By Q08 ② 10-13-01 Rmdr  
③ 11-13-01 Rsp w/0 eat  
④ 12-13-01 Rsp w/1 eat  
⑤ 1-13-02 Rsp w/2 eat  
⑥ 2-13-02 Rsp w/3 eat

RECEIVED

AUG 20 2001

PATENT DEPT.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/727,873

Applicant(s)

DENHOLM ET AL.

Examiner

Michael V. Meller

Art Unit

1651

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12-19 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-11, drawn to a method of using an enzyme composition, classified in class 514, subclass 851, for example.
- II. Claims 12-19, drawn to the enzyme composition, classified in class 435, subclass 232, for example.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions II and I are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product can be used in a materially distinct process such as treating cancer.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: the many different enzymes claimed and the many different disorders claimed to be treated by the enzymes.

Art Unit: 1651

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1 and 12 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.


During a telephone conversation with Patrea Pabst on 7/26/2001 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-11, organ fibrosis as the disorder and chondroitinase B as the enzyme. Affirmation of this

Art Unit: 1651

election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 12-19 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

#### ***Oath/Declaration***



The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:

Non-initialed and/or non-dated alterations have been made to the oath or declaration. See 37 CFR 1.52(c).

Claims 1-11 are being examined only in so far as they are drawn to the elected species, organ fibrosis as the disorder and chondroitinase B as the enzyme.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 is vague and indefinite since "modulate fibrosis tissue formation" is not clear. What does applicant mean by "modulate" ? This term has a very broad meaning and is relative and subjective. The metes and bounds of this claim are not clear on the record.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yacoby-Zeevi (Yacoby) taken with Triscott.

Yacoby teaches treating a patient suffering from cystic fibrosis with chondroitinases, see col. 1, lines 24-67, col. 6, line 52-col. 7, line 33, col. 7, line 35-col. 8, line 40, and the claims. This would encompass organ fibrosis since cystic fibrosis affects among other parts of the body, the lungs.

Art Unit: 1651

Yacoby does not teach using chondroitinase B. Further, the reference does not teach administering the composition systemically, topically, locally, or in a controlled or sustained formulation.

Triscott teaches that chondroitinases such as chondroitinase B (applicant's elected enzyme) from *Flavobacterium heparinum* is known in the art, see col. 6, lines 30-43.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use a chondroitinase B in the process of Yacoby since Triscott teaches that different chondroitinases are known in the art such as chondroitinase B for therapeutic purposes. Since Yacoby is not specific which chondroitinase is being used in his process, it would have been obvious to use chondroitinase B since to use such a well known chondroitinase is well within the skill of the artisan and it would have been a matter of obvious choice for one of ordinary skill in the art to use chondroitinase B in an effort to optimize the results of the invention.

To use different routes of administration also would have been obvious since different routes are well known in the art and one would want to optimize the most ways of administering the enzyme composition to a patient in need of it.

To formulate a controlled or sustained release formulation also would have been obvious since one routinely would want to deliver the medication at different times or to allow it to go into the body slower.

Art Unit: 1651

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael V. Meller whose telephone number is 703-308-4230. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday: 10:30am-7:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Wityshyn can be reached on 703-308-4743. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-0294 for regular communications and 703-308-0294 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

MVM

August 6, 2001

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Meller', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Michael Meller

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 1651